LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

MAY 23 1970
DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

October Term [redacted] 1970

No. [redacted] 180

LOUIS ZEMLER,

*Petitioner,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Respondent.*

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

STANLEY W. GREENFIELD,
*Counsel for Petitioner;*
412 Carlton House,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219.

BATAVIA TIMES, APPELLATE COURT PRINTERS,
EDWARD W. SHANNON, REPRESENTATIVE
5022 CARLYN DRIVE, PITTSBURGH, PA., 15236
412-881-7463

# INDEX.


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Opinions Below | 1 |
| Jurisdiction | 2 |
| Questions Presented | 2 |
| Statutes, Federal Rules and Regulations Involved | 3 |
| Statement | 3 |
| Reasons for Granting the Writ | 5 |
| Conclusion | 7 |
| Appendix: | |
| Opinion | 8 |
| Order | 9 |


## CITATIONS.


Cases:

| | |
|---|---|
| Benton v. Maryland, 395 U. S. 784 (1969) | 2, 5 |
| Gilbert v. California, 388 U. S. 263 (1967) | 3, 6 |
| Newlin v. U. S., 328 Fed. 2d 262 (10th Cir. 1964) | 6 |
| Simmons v. U. S., 399 U. S. 377 (1968) | 3, 6 |
| Stoval v. Denno, 388 U. S. 294 (1967) | 3, 6 |
| U. S. v. Carter, 401 F. 2d 748 at 751 (3rd Cir. 1968) | 6 |
| U. S. v. Gardner, 171 Fed. 2d 753 at 756 (7th Cir. 1948) | 6 |
| Wade v. U. S., 388 U. S. 218 (1967) | 3, 6 |

STATUTES:

| | |
|---|---|
| 18 U. S. C. 2314 | 2, 3 |
| 18 U. S. C. 659 | 3 |

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1969

No. .....

LOUIS ZEMLER,

*Petitioner,*

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Respondent.*

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

The Petitioner prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgments of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit entered in the above case on March 19, 1970, and on April 23, 1970, when Petition for rehearing was denied.

### Opinions Below

No opinion of the District Court for Nevada was written or reported. The opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is yet unreported but attached herewith. The Order of Court denying rehearing is as yet unreported and also attached herewith.

## Jurisdiction

The judgments of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit were made and entered on March 19, 1970, and on April 23, 1970, and copies thereof are appended to this petition in the Appendix at pp. 8-10. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. 1254(1).

## Questions Presented

1. Whether the Concurrent Sentence Rule should still be an appropriate rule of judicial convenience, and if so, whether in the light of *Benton v. Maryland*, 359 U. S. 784, 89 S. Ct. 2056 (1969) it should be applied, where because of the Ninth Circuit's refusal to consider his appeal on the merits, thus affirming his conviction, Petitioner, as a life-time parolee from Pennsylvania, faces the immediate and substantial prospect of recommitment to jail for life as a parole violator.

2. Whether the Ninth Circuit properly applied the Concurrent Sentence Rule at all, where Petitioner did in fact appeal from conviction of each of the three counts of his indictment.

3. Whether the Concurrent Sentence Rule, even if otherwise appropriate as a rule of judicial convenience, should be applied so as to permit the trial court to depart from proper judicial proceedings and:

a. Admit testimony to sustain a conviction of Petitioner for transportation of stolen securities *from* Las Vegas to New York in violation of 18 U. S. C. 2314 when the evidence is irrefutable that the securities were known by victims in Las Vegas to be stolen, and who nevertheless transmitted the securities to New York for payment.

b. Admit into evidence an illegal pre-trial confrontation of defendant in contravention of this Court's holding in *Stovall v. Denno*, 388 U. S. 294 (1967); *Wade v. U. S.*, 388 U. S. 218 (1967); and *Gilbert v. California*, 388 U. S. 263 (1967);

c. Allow the introduction of identification by witnesses who had been illegally shown photographs of the defendant after his arrest in contravention of the principles expressed in *Stovall v. Denno*, 388 U. S. 294 (1967); *Gilbert v. California*, 388 U. S. 263 (1967); and *Wade v. U. S.*, 388 U. S. 263 (1967); and also in Simmons v. U. S., 399 U. S. 377 (1968).

## Statutes, Federal Rules and Regulations Involved

18 U. S. C. 2314.
18 U. S. C. 659.

## Statement

This Petition is before this Court from the refusal of the Ninth Circuit to decide the issues raised in Petitioner's appeal from his conviction in the United States District Court in Las Vegas. Petitioner was indicted on April 16, 1968, in a three-count indictment as follows:

1. For transporting and causing to be transported in Interstate Commerce from New York to Las Vegas certain American Express Travelers Checks of a value in excess of $5,000 in violation of 18 U. S. C. 2314;

2. For falsely making and forging twenty of these American Express Travelers Checks in violation of U. S. C. 2314;

3. For having in his possession 400 American Express Travelers Checks which had been stolen from a foreign shipment of freight in violation of 18 U. S. C. 659.

Testimony at trial indicated that on September 29, 1967, travelers checks later identified as having been stolen in New York were being circulated in the Las Vegas area. Because of an alert from Central Clearing, personnel at the Las Vegas Club, Carosel Club, Freemont, Mint Casino and Horseshoe Club were able to confirm that some of the American Express Travelers Checks were cashed with them by a man using the name of Harry Katz. Thelma Akin, a cashier at the Las Vegas Club, alerted Las Vegas police when an individual approached her to cash five American Express Travelers Checks, the serial numbers of which corresponded to the reported stolen New York checks. Las Vegas police arrived in time to arrest Petitioner, manacle and return him to the lobby of the Las Vegas Club, confront him with Mrs. Akin and her superior, and then remove him to jail. A search of this person indicated he had a motel key, identification in the name of Harry Katz, some empty travelers check books and $700.

As a result of Petitioner's confrontation with Akin, Las Vegas police secured a search warrant, searched Room No. 12 of the Nomad Motel for which Petitioner had a key and recovered $8,100 in blank travelers checks which constituted the evidence for Petitioner's conviction on Count III.

Petitioner was eventually convicted on all three counts on August 27, 1968, after a jury trial before the Honorable Bruce R. Thompson. On November 1, 1968, Judge Thompson committed defendant to the custody of the Attorney General for imprisonment for seven years as to Count I, and to concurrent seven-year sentences with Count I, as to Count II and III. Notice of Appeal from this conviction and sentence as to all counts was filed November 4, 1968.

On appeal, the Ninth Circuit concluded that Petitioner had only appealed from Counts I and II, and not Count III, of his three-count conviction, and that since he was sentenced to a seven-year term on Count III, it was unnecessary to decide the merits of his appeal as to Counts I and II, thus invoking the Concurrent Sentence Rule.

## Reasons for Granting the Writ

The decision below should be reviewed because application of the Concurrent Sentence Rule by the Ninth Circuit and its consequent refusal to consider the substantial issues raised by Petitioner on appeal would result in actual, immediate and devastating harm to him. At the same time, it raises once again for determination the efficacy and vitality of the Concurrent Sentence Rule when in conflict with a defendant's constitutional rights[1].

Petitioner is on a lifetime parole in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Conviction in the instant case would constitute a violation of that parole and at once subject Petitioner to recommitment to jail for life as a parole violator. At least under these circumstances, therefore, the Concurrent Sentence Rule should have no validity and as expressed in *Benton, supra*, at 792, there should be "no good reason" to apply it here.

Moreover, the Ninth Circuit inappropriately invoked the Concurrent Sentence Rule altogether. It assumed as set forth in its opinion that no appeal had in fact been taken

[1] In *Benton v. Maryland*, 395 U. S. at 792, 89 S. Ct. at 2056, this Court found it unnecessary at that time to resolve once and for all the contention that Federal Appellate Courts should treat all errors which may possibly affect a defendant's rights and that, therefore, the Concurrent Sentence Rule should have no continuing validity, even as a rule of convenience. In any event, this Court specifically held there, 359 U. S. at 73, 89 S. Ct. at 2061 "It is sufficient for present purposes to hold that there is no judicial bar to consideration of challenges to multiple convictions, even though concurrent sentences were imposed."

from Count III of the indictment and conviction. However, Notice of Appeal dated November 4, 1968, specifically included Count III in the appeal. Furthermore, Petitioner's oral argument and Brief in the Circuit, Page 7, pointedly contended that the Search Warrant secured to recover the money orders, which supported Petitioner's conviction under Count III, was obtained on the strength of an Affidavit which contained the observations of Witness Akin before whom the Petitioner had been illegally presented without counsel in violation of this Court's holdings in *Wade v. U. S.*, 388 U. S. 263 (1967); *Stoval v. Denno*, 338 U. S. 294 (1967); and *Gilbert v. California*, 388 U. S. 263 (1967).

Indeed, as was argued to the Circuit, the entire indictment, including Count III, was underpinned not only by Akin's testimony of her illegal confrontation of Petitioner, but by her testimony that she saw a display of photographs including one of the Petitioner after his arrest on September 29, 1967 (T. 62) and that Witness Latham had seen a similar display (T. 117), all we contend in violation of the mandate of *Wade*, *Gilbert* and *Stoval*, *supra*, and *Simmons v. U. S.*, 399 U. S. 377 (1968).

Application of the Concurrent Sentence Rule permitted Petitioner's conviction for transportation of stolen Securities from Las Vegas to New York which unarguably was impermissible under the holdings in *U. S. v. Carter*, 401 F. 2d 748 at 751 (3rd Cir. 1968); *U. S. v. Gardner*, 171 F. 2d 753 at 756 (7th Cir. 1948); and *Newlin v. U. S.*, 328 F. 2d 262 (10th Cir. 1964).

As the record demonstrates (T. 130), testimony by each of two witnesses unequivocally established that each was aware that the checks in their possession and introduced against Petitioner at his trial to support his conviction

under Count II were known to have been stolen before they were negotiated for payment back to New York. These checks could thus not possibly be the basis for a charge that Petitioner caused them to be transported from Las Vegas to New York, since each victim was thus an intervening force to that transportation.

## Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that this Petition for Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

STANLEY W. GREENFIELD,
*Attorney for Petitioner.*

**Opinion**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

---

LOUIS ZEMLER,

*Appellant,*

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Appellee.*

---

No. 23,857.

---

[March 19, 1970]

**Appeal from the United States District Court**
**For the District of Nevada**

Before: BARNES, HUFSTEDLER and WRIGHT, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:

Appellant was convicted on three counts of transporting, forging and possessing American Express Travelers Checks which had been either stolen, or forged, or stolen from foreign freight. 18 U. S. C. §§ 659 & 2314. Sentence was seven years on each count, to be served concurrently.

Appellant has not appealed from his conviction on Count III. We are therefore not required to decide the issues raised as to Counts I & II, and we conclude we will not do so. *Sinclair v. United States*, 279 U. S. 263, 299 (1929); *United States v. Romano*, 382 U. S. 136, 138 (1965); *Duran v. United States*, 413 F. 2d 596 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 396 U. S. 917 (1969); *Banzer v. United States*, 367 F. 2d 865 (9th Cir. 1966), *cert. denied*, 385 U. S. 1009 (1967); *Wilson v. United States*, 316 F. 2d 212 (9th Cir. 1963), *cert. denied*, 379 U. S. 960 (1964).

We AFFIRM.

**Order**

IN THE

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

vs.

LOUIS ZEMLER, aka HARRY KATZ,

*Defendant-Appellant.*

---

No. 23,857.

---

Before: BARNES, HUFSTEDLER and WRIGHT, *Circuit Judges.*

Counsel for appellant files an untimely petition for rehearing, and a supporting affidavit, which, if accurate, indicates he made no effort between March 23, 1970 and April 9, 1970 to obtain an extension of time permitted by Rule 41(a), which he now also seeks by motion.

Nevertheless, we order the petition and order filed.

While appellant specified in his notice of appeal that he appealed from the conviction on Count III, 18 U. S. C. § 659 (*possession* of goods and chattels stolen from foreign commerce), he did not brief or argue Count III on appeal.

Appellant's brief on appeal raised four arguments. The first related to Exhibits 15 and 16 and Count I only; the second to the weight of the identification of defendant by witness Akin *only*; the third, a line-up identification

problem relating to both the witness Latham and Akin—and Exhibits 6 and 13, without relation to Count III; and the fourth, Exhibits 6 and 13, relating to similar cashing of Express checks not charged as criminal acts in the indictment.

The first point disregarded testimony of other identification witnesses (such as Schriber, R. T. 66).

No issue was raised with regard to any proof of *possession* of Exhibit 11, or to the other testimony (a) that certain numbered traveler's checks were stolen in the State of New York (testimony of Mulhearn and Shea); (b) passed or attempted to be passed in Nevada (Ex. 7, T. R. 805); and (c) that the appellant had certain of the numbered checks stolen from foreign commerce in New York in his personal *possession* in Las Vegas (Ex. 7, Tr. 70-82), as well as having possession of others seized puruant to a search (made after issuance of a search warrant, Exs. 9, 10) of the defendant's hotel room, which consisted of forty books of the stolen traveler's checks (Plaintiff's Ex. 11). Thus it is clear that the appellant was guilty of Count III, which perhaps explains why an appeal was technically taken from the conviction on Count III, but never raised or mentioned in the appellant's brief nor during oral argument.

The petition for rehearing is denied.

The motion to stay mandate pending petition for certiorari will be granted in the usual separate form of order.